



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,184	07/10/2001	Robert Craig Murphy	07099.1529	7537
826	7590	01/25/2007		
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			EXAMINER LY, ANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APR 11 2006

2162
JAV

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. ...
09/902,184	07/10/2001	Robert Craig Murphy	07099.1529	7537
826	7590	04/05/2006	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			LY, ANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/902,184		MURPHY ET AL	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Anh Ly		2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-162) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' AMENDMENT filed on 01/23/2006.
2. Claims 27-47 have been added.
3. Claims 1-47 are pending in this Application.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statements filed 07/25/2002; Paper #8 has not been considered because Examiner did not receive PTO-1449, Applicant is hereby required to submit PTO-1449 in response to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 7, 13 & 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the line 10 of claim 1, "the same customer" is not clearly. It is referring to the first or the second customer. Also in the line 13 of claim 1, "assigning an identifier" is missing the person or object to be assigned that identifier (to whom). As the result, the claims 7 (lines 12 and 15), 13 (lines 10 and 13) and 19 (lines 14 and 18) are having the same above reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 7, 17, 19, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because these claims are missing the step or process for "sharing customer information" as the preamble stated like that. That caused the claimed invention is not to produce a real world result or no "tangible result". State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: 20030046309 A1 of McGrath et al. (hereinafter McGrath) in view of US Patent No. 6,363,388 issued to Sprenger et al. (hereinafter Sprenger).

With respect to claim 1, McGrath teaches a method for sharing customer information among a plurality of electronic facilities (a method for accessing the shared customer data storing at data storage devices 14a-n as in the fig. 1, paragraphs 0024 and 0029), comprising:

providing a mass data store comprising in a first data record identifying information for a customer having an associated first customer identifier (fig. 3, item 202, paragraph 0046);

receiving identifying information on the customer from an electronic storage facility containing information about the customer including a second customer identifier that is different from the first customer identifier (fig. 3, receiving data from a storage device as shown in fig. 3, item 202 and paragraphs 0032 and 0046);

storing the received identifying information in a second data record (storing the received customer data: fig. 1, paragraphs 0017, 0018, 0024 and 0029); and

assigning an identifier based on a result of the determination (assigning that customer identifier based on the result of comparing of the received each record: paragraph 0046).

McGrath teaches a plurality of data storage devices storing the customer data (fig. 1 and paragraph 0017), which is identifying information for a customer including customer ID or customer identifier from which it is used to identify a particular customer or entity associated with customer database; also customer detail is used to describe the customer identified by customer identifier (paragraph 0035). McGrath also teaches cross-reference data (fig. 5s). McGrath does not clearly teach determining that the identifying information in the first and the second data records are associated with the same customer; and cross-referencing the assigned identifier with identifying information stored in the first and second data records.

However, Sprenger teaches the same customer based on customer information (col. 21, lines 28-52) and using the cross-reference identifier of a customer as shown in the fig. 5 (col. 21, lines 45-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of McGrath with the teachings of Sprenger, wherein customer database consisting a plurality of records of customer information/data for enabling a user/operator or agent to access the data in the system provided therein (McGrath's figs. 1, 2 & 3), would incorporate the use of customer table storing customer identifier to be used as a cross-referenced identifier to access the right customer in the customer database, in the same conventional manner as described by Sprenger (col. 21, lines 45-52). The motivation being to be efficiently to access and share customer information over a system with multiple storage facilities.

With respect to claim 2, McGrath teaches retrieving identifying information from the master data store based on an identifier (fig. 3).

With respect to claim 3, McGrath teaches wherein identifying information includes a storage identifier to identify an electronic storage facility transmitting identifying information, a customer identifier for identifying customer information in the electronic storage facility (fig. 3, 4 & 5); and

customer data for matching a customer with existing customers in the master data store (paragraphs 0046-0048).

With respect to claim 4, McGrath teaches wherein customer data includes a customer's name and address (paragraph 0035).

With respect to claim 5, McGrath teaches wherein determining comprises: standardizing the received identifying information and comparing the standardized identifying information to existing data in the master data store (paragraphs 0039-0043)).

With respect to claim 6, McGrath teaches a method for sharing customer information as discussed in claim 1.

McGrath teaches a plurality of data storage devices storing the customer data (fig. 1 and paragraph 0017), which is identifying information for a customer including customer ID or customer identifier from which it is used to identify a particular customer or entity associated with customer database; also customer detail is used to describe the customer identified by customer identifier (paragraph 0035). McGrath also teaches cross-reference data (fig. 5s). McGrath does not clearly teach cross-referencing the

assigned identifier with the received identifying information and an indication of the electronic storage facility containing the customer information.

However, Sprenger teaches the same customer based on customer information (col. 21, lines 28-52) and using the cross-reference identifier of a customer as shown in the fig. 5 (col. 21, lines 45-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of McGrath with the teachings of Sprenger, wherein customer database consisting a plurality of records of customer information/data for enabling a user/operator or agent to access the data in the system provided therein (McGrath's figs. 1, 2 & 3), would incorporate the use of customer table storing customer identifier to be used as a cross-referenced identifier to access the right customer in the customer database, in the same conventional manner as described by Sprenger (col. 21, lines 45-52). The motivation being to be efficiently to access and share customer information over a system with multiple storage facilities.

Claim 7 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 9 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 19, McGrath teaches a plurality of electronic storage facilities for storing customer information associated with and identifying a customer; a mass data storing comprising in a first data record identifying information for the customer having an associated first customer identifier; and an information system for receiving customer information from an electronic storage facility, said information system capable of : receiving identifying information on the customer from an electronic storage facility containing information about the customer including a second customer identifier that is different from the first customer identifier (a method for accessing the shared customer data storing at data storage devices 14a-n as in the fig. 1, paragraphs 0024 and 0029; fig. 3, item 202, paragraph 0046fig. 3, receiving data from a storage device as shown in fig. 3, item 202 and paragraphs 0032 and 0046); storing the received identifying information in a second data record (storing the received customer data: fig. 1, paragraphs 0017, 0018, 0024 and 0029); and assigning an identifier based

on a result of the determination (assigning that customer identifier based on the result of comparing of the received each record: paragraph 0046).

McGrath teaches a plurality of data storage devices storing the customer data (fig. 1 and paragraph 0017), which is identifying information for a customer including customer ID or customer identifier from which it is used to identify a particular customer or entity associated with customer database; also customer detail is used to describe the customer identified by customer identifier (paragraph 0035). McGrath also teaches cross-reference data (fig. 5s). McGrath does not clearly teach determining that the identifying information in the first and the second data records are associated with the same customer; and cross-referencing the assigned identifier with identifying information stored in the first and second data records.

However, Sprenger teaches the same customer based on customer information (col. 21, lines 28-52) and using the cross-reference identifier of a customer as shown in the fig. 5 (col. 21, lines 45-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of McGrath with the teachings of Sprenger, wherein customer database consisting a plurality of records of customer information/data for enabling a user/operator or agent to access the data in the system provided therein (McGrath's figs. 1, 2 & 3), would incorporate the use of customer table storing customer identifier to be used as a cross-referenced identifier to access the right customer in the customer database, in the same conventional manner

as described by Sprenger (col. 21, lines 45-52). The motivation being to be efficiently to access and share customer information over a system with multiple storage facilities.

With respect to claim 20, McGrath teaches wherein said information system is further configured to: retrieve customer information from the master data store based on the identifier (see fig. 3).

With respect to claim 21, McGrath teaches wherein the customer information includes a storage identifier to identify said respective electronic storage facility transmitting the travel-based information, a customer identifier for identifying customer information in said electronic storage facility; and customer data for matching a customer with existing customers in the master data store (figs. 3, 4 & 5 and paragraphs 0046-0048).

With respect to claim 22, McGrath teaches a system for sharing customer information as discussed in claim 19.

McGrath teaches a plurality of data storage devices storing the customer data (fig. 1 and paragraph 0017), which is identifying information for a customer including customer ID or customer identifier from which it is used to identify a particular customer or entity associated with customer database; also customer detail is used to describe the customer identified by customer identifier (paragraph 0035). McGrath also teaches cross-reference data (fig. 5s). McGrath does not clearly teach cross-referencing the assigned identifier with the received identifying information and an indication of the electronic storage facility containing the customer information.

However, Sprenger teaches the same customer based on customer information (col. 21, lines 28-52) and using the cross-reference identifier of a customer as shown in the fig. 5 (col. 21, lines 45-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of McGrath with the teachings of Sprenger, wherein customer database consisting a plurality of records of customer information/data for enabling a user/operator or agent to access the data in the system provided therein (McGrath's figs. 1, 2 & 3), would incorporate the use of customer table storing customer identifier to be used as a cross-referenced identifier to access the right customer in the customer database, in the same conventional manner as described by Sprenger (col. 21, lines 45-52). The motivation being to be efficiently to access and share customer information over a system with multiple storage facilities.

With respect to claim 23, McGrath teaches a plurality of electronic storage facilities for storing customer information associated with and identifying a customer, wherein each electronic storage facility uses a different identifier to identify the customer information; a mass data storing comprising for each customer a unique identifier identifying the customer and a list of the electronic facilities that contain information for the customer along with the identification for the customer used by each electronic storage facility; and an information system for receiving customer information from an electronic storage facility, said information system capable of : receiving identifying information on the customer from an electronic storage facility containing information about the customer including a second customer identifier that is different from the first

Art Unit: 2162

customer identifier (a method for accessing the shared customer data storing at data storage devices 14a-n as in the fig. 1, paragraphs 0024 and 0029; fig. 3, item 202, paragraph 0046; fig. 3, receiving data from a storage device as shown in fig. 3, item 202 and paragraphs 0032 and 0046; figs. 3, 4 & 5 and paragraphs 0046-0048); storing the received identifying information in a second data record (storing the received customer data: fig. 1, paragraphs 0017, 0018, 0024 and 0029); and assigning an identifier based on a result of the determination (assigning that customer identifier based on the result of comparing of the received each record: paragraph 0046).

McGrath teaches a plurality of data storage devices storing the customer data (fig. 1 and paragraph 0017), which is identifying information for a customer including customer ID or customer identifier from which it is used to identify a particular customer or entity associated with customer database; also customer detail is used to describe the customer identified by customer identifier (paragraph 0035). McGrath also teaches cross-reference data (fig. 5s). McGrath does not clearly teach determining that the identifying information in the first and the second data records are associated with the same customer; and cross-referencing the assigned identifier with identifying information stored in the first and second data records.

However, Sprenger teaches the same customer based on customer information (col. 21, lines 28-52) and using the cross-reference identifier of a customer as shown in the fig. 5 (col. 21, lines 45-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of McGrath with the

teachings of Sprenger, wherein customer database consisting a plurality of records of customer information/data for enabling a user/operator or agent to access the data in the system provided therein (McGrath's figs. 1, 2 & 3), would incorporate the use of customer table storing customer identifier to be used as a cross-referenced identifier to access the right customer in the customer database, in the same conventional manner as described by Sprenger (col. 21, lines 45-52). The motivation being to be efficiently to access and share customer information over a system with multiple storage facilities.

With respect to claim 24, McGrath teaches wherein when said information system receives an inquiry for information associated with a customer, said information system provides information indicating which electronic storage facilities contain information related to the customer and the identification used by each electronic facility to identify the customer's information (figs. 3, 4 & 5 and paragraphs 0046-0048).

With respect to claim 25, McGrath teaches a method for sharing customer information among a plurality of electronic storage facilities (a method for accessing the shared customer data storing at data storage devices 14a-n as in the fig. 1, paragraphs 0024 and 0029), comprising:

providing a plurality of electronic storage facilities, wherein each storage facility contains information concerning a customer and uses a different identifier to identify the customer information from that of the other electronic storage facilities and storing in a master data store for each customer a unique identifier identifying the customer and a list of the electronic facilities that contain information for the customer along with the identification for the customer used by each electronic storage facility; and an

information system for receiving customer information from an electronic storage facility, said information system capable of : receiving identifying information on the customer from an electronic storage facility containing information about the customer including a second customer identifier that is different from the first customer identifier (a method for accessing the shared customer data storing at data storage devices 14a-n as in the fig. 1, paragraphs 0024 and 0029; fig. 3, item 202, paragraph 0046; fig. 3, receiving data from a storage device as shown in fig. 3, item 202 and paragraphs 0032 and 0046; figs. 3, 4 & 5 and paragraphs 0046-0048); storing the received identifying information in a second data record (storing the received customer data: fig. 1, paragraphs 0017, 0018, 0024 and 0029); and assigning an identifier based on a result of the determination (assigning that customer identifier based on the result of comparing of the received each record: paragraph 0046).

McGrath teaches a plurality of data storage devices storing the customer data (fig. 1 and paragraph 0017), which is identifying information for a customer including customer ID or customer identifier from which it is used to identify a particular customer or entity associated with customer database; also customer detail is used to describe the customer identified by customer identifier (paragraph 0035). McGrath also teaches cross-reference data (figs. 5s). McGrath does not clearly teach determining that the identifying information in the first and the second data records are associated with the same customer; and cross-referencing the assigned identifier with identifying information stored in the first and second data records.

However, Sprenger teaches the same customer based on customer information (col. 21, lines 28-52) and using the cross-reference identifier of a customer as shown in the fig. 5 (col. 21, lines 45-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of McGrath with the teachings of Sprenger, wherein customer database consisting a plurality of records of customer information/data for enabling a user/operator or agent to access the data in the system provided therein (McGrath's figs. 1, 2 & 3), would incorporate the use of customer table storing customer identifier to be used as a cross-referenced identifier to access the right customer in the customer database, in the same conventional manner as described by Sprenger (col. 21, lines 45-52). The motivation being to be efficiently to access and share customer information over a system with multiple storage facilities.

With respect to claim 26, McGrath teaches receiving an inquiry for information associated with a customer; accessing the master data store; and providing information indicating which electronic storage facilities contain information related to the customer and the identification used by each electronic facility to identify the customer's information (see figs. 1, 2 & 3 and 5s and paragraphs 0046-0048).

With respect to claim 27, McGrath teaches wherein the first and second data records comprise identifying information identifying the customer and an indication of the electronic storage facility containing the customer information (paragraphs 0021-0025)

With respect to claims 28-29, McGrath teaches a method as discussed in claim

1.

McGrath teaches a plurality of data storage devices storing the customer data (fig. 1 and paragraph 0017), which is identifying information for a customer including customer ID or customer identifier from which it is used to identify a particular customer or entity associated with customer database; also customer detail is used to describe the customer identified by customer identifier (paragraph 0035). McGrath also teaches cross-reference data (fig. 5s). McGrath does not clearly teach wherein said cross-referencing comprises cross-referencing the assigned identifier with the identifying information identifying the customer and an indication of the electronic storage facility containing the customer information for the first and second data records; and wherein said determining step comprises comparing the identifying information in the first and second data records to thereby determine whether the identifying information is for the same customer.

However, Sprenger teaches the same customer based on customer information (col. 21, lines 28-52) and using the cross-reference identifier of a customer as shown in the fig. 5 (col. 21, lines 45-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of McGrath with the teachings of Sprenger, wherein customer database consisting a plurality of records of customer information/data for enabling a user/operator or agent to access the data in the system provided therein (McGrath's figs. 1, 2 & 3), would incorporate the use of

Art Unit: 2162

customer table storing customer identifier to be used as a cross-referenced identifier to access the right customer in the customer database, in the same conventional manner as described by Sprenger (col. 21, lines 45-52). The motivation being to be efficiently to access and share customer information over a system with multiple storage facilities.

With respect to claim 30, McGrath teaches wherein identifying information includes a storage identifier to identify an electronic storage facility comprising the customer information and a customer identifier for identifying customer information in the electronic storage facility (paragraphs: 0027 and 0030).

With respect to claim 31, McGrath teaches wherein said determining step comprises comparing the customer data in the first and second data records to thereby determine whether the identifying information is for the same customer (paragraphs 0036 and 0039).

With respect to claim 32, McGrath teaches wherein said providing step provides a mass data store comprising a plurality of data records, wherein some of the data records are for the same customer but stored in different electronic storage facilities, where the electronic storage facilities use the same customer identifier (paragraphs 0024, 0029 and 0039).

With respect to claim 33, McGrath teaches wherein the customer information is travel-related information (paragraph 0030).

Claim 34 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 27 hereinabove.

Claim 35 is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 28 hereinabove.

Claim 36 is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 29 hereinabove.

Claim 37 is essentially the same as claim 30 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 30 hereinabove.

Claim 38 is essentially the same as claim 31 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 31 hereinabove.

Claim 39 is essentially the same as claim 32 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 32 hereinabove.

Claim 40 is essentially the same as claim 33 except that it is directed to a computer for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 33 hereinabove.

Claim 41 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 27 hereinabove.

Claim 42 is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 28 hereinabove.

Claim 43 is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 29 hereinabove.

Claim 44 is essentially the same as claim 30 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 30 hereinabove.

Claim 45 is essentially the same as claim 31 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 31 hereinabove.

Claim 46 is essentially the same as claim 32 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 32 hereinabove.

Claim 47 is essentially the same as claim 33 except that it is directed to a system for sharing customer information rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 33 hereinabove.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to **(571) 273-4039**. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or **Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center **(571) 273-8300**.


JEAN CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY 
MAR. 30th, 2006